



Security Council

Distr.: General
26 June 2003

Original: English

**Letter dated 26 June 2003 from the Permanent Representative of
the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations
addressed to the President of the Security Council**

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 26 June 2003 addressed to you from His Excellency Mr. Paek Nam Sun, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

I should be grateful if you could have the text of the present letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) **Pak Gil Yon**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative



Annex

Annex to the letter dated 26 June 2003 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

(Translation)

Pyongyang, 26 June Juche 92 (2003)

I would like to express hereby the viewpoint of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) with regard to the fact that one permanent member of the United Nations Security Council has started a diplomatic negotiation to bring before the Security Council the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula.

The United Nations Security Council assumes an important responsibility of safeguarding international peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. This task requires the greatest impartiality.

In particular, since the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula is one between a small country and a big country, only a fair approach by the Security Council will contribute to ensuring peace and security on the Korean peninsula and in the rest of the Asia-Pacific region and to restoring the authority of the United Nations.

In this respect, I wish to draw your attention to the following points, to which I hope the Security Council will pay primary attention with regard to the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula.

First, the Security Council should define its view and express its position on the doctrine of the "axis of evil" and the "pre-emptive strike", as it is now the most fundamental issue that has a great impact on international relations and global peace and security.

Targets of the doctrine of the "axis of evil" and the "pre-emptive strike" insisted on and adopted as a policy by one permanent member of the Security Council are the States Members of the United Nations.

As this policy is put into practice, it gives rise to complicated situations that jeopardize global peace and security.

The nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula and the aggravated tensions of the region surrounding this issue are no exception.

The Security Council should pronounce due judgement on whether the said doctrine and the policy based on it conform to the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

Second, it is important that the Security Council have good insight into the essence of the positions in the talks of the parties concerned with the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula.

In view of the history and complexity of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula and from the viewpoint of the responsibility for resolving it and the ability

to resolve it, it is reasonable that the issue should be resolved through an organic combination of all necessary forms of talks.

The Government of the DPRK wishes to have bilateral, tripartite and multilateral or any other form of talks proposed by the concerned parties and other countries concerned in an appropriate order.

Since tripartite talks were held in Beijing in April, it would be productive for DPRK-United States of America bilateral talks to be held next and then tripartite or further expanded talks.

The United States, however, creates a precondition that one form of talks is acceptable but another form of talks is not acceptable.

What we desire most with regard to the nuclear issue is to thoroughly eliminate the threats to the security of the DPRK, which have given rise to the nuclear issue.

The real dire threats come not from the countries surrounding us, but from the United States.

Herein lies the reason why the DPRK attaches priority to the DPRK-United States bilateral talks.

It is my view that the Security Council should, if it wishes to promote a correct resolution of the issue, clearly see what kind of position is really helpful for the resolution of an issue and make a practical contribution to it.

Third, the United Nations Security Council should avoid giving any impression that it might apply double standards.

If the Security Council is truly interested in the extension of the scope of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), it should ask all countries remaining outside the NPT to join it.

As is well known, the DPRK is not the only country remaining outside the NPT. Among non-NPT State parties, Israel has been subject to more suspicion of nuclear development for a much longer period of time than the DPRK.

As for the DPRK's withdrawal from the NPT, it is an exercise of its sovereign rights recognized by the NPT itself and, therefore, does not in any way deserve condemnation.

Any condemnation by the Security Council of the rights exercised under Article 10 of the NPT, which provides for withdrawal, will be tantamount to condemnation by the United Nations of the NPT itself.

There is no reason whatsoever to apply such terminology as "non-implementation of the Safeguards Agreement" of the International Atomic Energy Agency in the case of the DPRK.

According to the DPRK-United States Agreed Framework, we were supposed to fully implement the Safeguards Agreement only after all non-nuclear parts, such as turbines and generators for the light water reactor No. 1, had been delivered.

Unfortunately, however, the agreed time never came, and the DPRK withdrew from the NPT.

If the Security Council resorts to double standards in the interpretation and application of international instruments, any decision or measure it adopts will not be persuasive and will be difficult to accept.

Fourth, the Security Council has moral obligations to judge, in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as to whether or not it would be justifiable for one State Member of the United Nations to stifle another Member State.

At present, the United States pursues a policy of combining both "dialogue and pressure" towards the DPRK.

The United States is seeking to put in place a legal system aimed at checking and controlling, based on its intelligence information, the vessels and aircraft of other countries passing through its territorial waters and airspace. Japan, which is our neighbour, has already taken action to realize it.

After all, we can say that this has originated from the doctrine of the United States, which is the world's largest arms seller, that its intelligence information should serve as a standard to judge the legitimacy and illegitimacy of international trade and as a basis to apply pressure to any State Member of the United Nations.

The war in Iraq constitutes a well-proven example that the intelligence information of the United States may be abused for political purposes in disregard of the principle of impartiality.

If this is allowed with the support or acquiescence of the Security Council, it will result in a negative change in the international order.

It can be said that the United Nations is now at a crossroads and must decide whether it will maintain the international order led by the United Nations or give way to the establishment of dangerous world order led by an individual country.

It is a common view of the international community that the Security Council should under no circumstances be used as a cover-up to justify unilateralism or a policy of pressure pursued by a certain country.

Fifth, we consider that the Security Council should pay due attention, when considering the situation on the Korean peninsula, to the current status of the Korean Armistice Agreement, with which the Security Council has a deep connection.

The United States has recently decided to bring into South Korea modern, sophisticated weapons estimated at 11 billion United States dollars. This is a violation of paragraph 13, article II, of the Armistice Agreement, which bans the introduction of weapons into the Korean peninsula.

The United States has also decided to redeploy its troops in South Korea and is trying to shift the responsibility for control of the demilitarized zone from the United States Army to the South Korean army. This is a violation of paragraph 10, article I, of the Armistice Agreement, which stipulates that the demilitarized zone shall be controlled by the Korean People's Army and the United States Army.

The sea and air blockade pursued by the United States against the DPRK through "inspection of vessels and aircraft" is a violation of paragraph 15, article II,

of the Armistice Agreement, which stipulates "not to engage in blockade of any kind of Korea".

The seriousness of the issue lies in the fact that, if the Armistice Agreement is abrogated by way of such violations as mentioned above, the Korean peninsula will go back to a warring situation.

It will be inevitable to a certain degree that, when confidence is lost in the power of the Armistice Agreement to deter war, the demand for other means of deterrence will rise.

I still wish to think that the Security Council has not yet wandered from its objectivity and impartiality.

In case the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula is debated in the Security Council, I look forward to the Council's just and reasonable efforts for a peaceful solution of the nuclear issue in keeping with its noble mission and responsibility by taking into due consideration the aforementioned points.

(Signed) **Paek Nam Sun**
Minister for Foreign Affairs
Democratic People's Republic of Korea